| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/933,956 | 08/21/2001 | Ramesh R. Sarukkai | 324212009600 | 7521 |

25226      7590      08/23/2007
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 PAGE MILL RD
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| WOZNIAK, JAMES S |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2626 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 08/23/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | **Application No.** | **Applicant(s)** |
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/933,956 | SARUKKAI, RAMESH R. |
| | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** | |
| | James S. Wozniak | 2626 | |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 May 2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>15-25, 31, and 34-38</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>15-25 and 31</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>34-38</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 August 2001</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1.      In response to the office action from 4/25/2007, the applicant has submitted a request for

continued examination, filed 5/18/2007, adding new claims 34-38, while canceling claims 1-14

and 32-33 and arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the prompt mapping limitations in

the new claims *(Amendment, Pages 8-9)*. The applicant's arguments have been fully considered

but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection in view of Ladd et al *(U.S. Patent:*

*6,269,336)* and Uppaluru *(U.S. Patent: 5,915,001)*.

### *Response to Arguments*

2.      The applicant's arguments with respect to new claims 34-38 have been fully considered

but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection in view of Ladd et al *(U.S. Patent:*

*6,269,336)* and Uppaluru *(U.S. Patent: 5,915,001)*. Also, in response to the applicant's

argument that Ladd fails to teach using browser context to limit text/utterance matching searches

*(Amendment, Pages 8-9)*, the examiner points out that Ladd discloses searching for a specific

completed variable audio prompt based on a current user browser state and user input

*(generating specific audio prompts based on XML mapping and user voice inputs, Col. 37, Line*

*8- Col. 40, Line 24; Col. 29, Lines 36-57; see also below rejections)*. Thus, since Ladd discloses

searching for a complete audio prompt file based on a browser state corresponding to a voice

browser user input *(i.e., context)*, Ladd discloses the aforementioned limitation.

### *Claim Objections*

3.      **Claim 34** is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 34, line 8, "configuration," should be changed to –configuration; and--.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as.a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.      **Claims 34-35 and 37-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ladd et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,269,336)* in view of Uppaluru *(U.S. Patent: 5,915,001)*.

With respect to **Claim 34**, Ladd discloses:

A database referencing a plurality of audio segments, each audio segment of the plurality

associated with an identifier that uniquely identifies that audio segment *(TTS audio file database,*

*each audio file having a unique identifier, Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11; Col. 18, Lines 33-*

*44, and Col. 29, Lines 36-57)*;

A prompt audio object for receiving a text string, and determining an audio segment to render for the voice browser by referencing a prompt mapping configuration *(generating an audio announcement, Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11; and generating specific audio prompts based on XML mapping and user voice inputs, Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24; Col. 29, Lines 36-57)*;

The prompt mapping configuration comprising a plurality of prompt classes, a plurality of occurrences of a plurality of text strings *(variable prompts corresponding to XML text, each substitutable variable element having a prompt class identifier; example of weather report generation for a specific city tag, Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24)*,

Wherein the prompt audio object is configured to receive contextual information about the browsing session, to use the contextual information to determine a prompt class in which to match the received text string to a text string occurrence, and to determine to render the audio segment associated with the matched text string occurrence *(generating specific audio prompts based on XML mapping and user voice browser inputs, Col. 17, Line 61- Col. 18, Line 40; Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24; Col. 29, Lines 36-57)*.

Although Ladd teaches a voice browser system that is capable of generating an audio prompt based on a voice browser user input and utilizes a prompt mapping configuration, Ladd does not explicitly teach a prompt mapping configuration having a plurality of occurrences of the same text strings, wherein each of the occurrences of each text string are associated with a prompt class and corresponding audio segment identifier, which is different from the other occurrences of that text string. Uppaluru, however, discloses such a mapping configuration. Uppaluru discloses that instances of the same numerical text sequence or character text sequence

are mapped to different audio prompts based on a context *(same numerical text spoken*

*differently as money, decimal, date, etc. and same character text spoken differently as a word or*

*spoken sequence of characters, Col. 22, Line 32- Col. 23)*.

Ladd and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in

voice-enabled browsers. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Ladd with the further prompt mapping

scheme taught by Uppaluru in order to provide a further means of specifying how audio data

should be presented to a user *(Uppaluru, Col. 8, Lines 11-13)*.

With respect to **Claim 35**, Ladd discloses:

Receiving a text string to use in identifying an audio segment to render in the voice

browser *(received text corresponding to files in a TTS audio file database, Col. 10, Line 58- Col.*

*11, Line 11; Col. 18, Lines 33-44, and Col. 29, Lines 36-57)*;

Receiving contextual information related to the browsing session *(user voice inputs that*

*define a dialog context in a voice browsing session, Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24; Col. 29,*

*Lines 36-57; Col. 16, Lines 41-57; and Col. 17, Line 45- Col. 18, Line 45)*;

Using the contextual information to identify a class of audio segments from a plurality of

classes *(variable prompts corresponding to XML text, each substitutable variable element having*

*a prompt class identifier; example of weather report generation for a specific city tag, Col. 37,*

*Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24)*;

Identifying an audio segment identifier by searching within the identified class for a text

string matching the received text string *(searching variable prompts corresponding to XML text,*

*each substitutable variable element having a prompt class identifier; example of weather report*

*generation for a specific city tag, Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24; and Col. 29, Lines 36-56)*;

and

Obtaining an audio segment based on the identified audio segment identified to render for

the voice browser *(generating an audio announcement, Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11)*.

Although Ladd teaches a voice browser system that is capable of generating an audio

prompt based on a voice browser user input and utilizes a prompt mapping configuration, Ladd

does not explicitly teach a prompt mapping configuration having classes associating an audio.

segment identifier unique among the plurality of classes with a text string unique within the

identified class. Uppaluru, however, discloses such a mapping configuration. Uppaluru

discloses that instances of the same numerical text sequence or character text sequence are

mapped to different audio prompts based on a context *(same numerical text spoken differently as*

*money, decimal, date, etc. and same character text spoken differently as a word or spoken*

*sequence of characters, Col. 22, Line 32- Col. 23)*.

Ladd and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in

voice-enabled browsers. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Ladd with the further prompt mapping

scheme taught by Uppaluru in order to provide a further means of specifying how audio data

should be presented to a user *(Uppaluru, Col. 8, Lines 11-13)*.

With respect to **Claim 37**, Ladd further discloses:

Providing a markup language document comprising a first prompt type element defining

a first context and a second prompt type element defining a second context, and wherein the

received contextual information is based on a current interpreting context in the markup

language document *(markup language documents having first and second context elements,*

*which are changed based on voice browser user inputs, Figs. 7 and 8; and Col. 37, Line 8- Col.*

*40, Line 24).*

With respect to **Claim 38**, Ladd further discloses:

Providing a markup language document comprising at least two context indicating

elements, which each define a browser context *(markup language documents having first and*

*second context elements, which are changed based on voice browser user inputs, Figs. 7 and 8;*

*and Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24)*;

In each browser context of the markup language document, providing a text string

comprising one or more words, wherein at least one of the portions in each text string is common

among the text strings of each browser context, each text string for voice rendering to a voice

browser during a browsing session by determining utterances that match words of the text string

*(XML text corresponding to multiple variable prompts, having common static portions, each*

*substitutable variable element having a prompt class identifier; example of weather report*

*generation for a specific city tag, Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24; and specific audio identifier*

*corresponding to a text string, Col. 29, Lines 36-56)*;

Searching within a text string to utterance mapping configuration, wherein each text

string/utterance mapping is associated with a browser context, the search narrowed to search

only within text string/utterance mappings associated with the current browser context

*(searching implemented to complete variable prompts corresponding to XML text, each*

*substitutable variable searched only with respect to a current browser context; and example of*

*weather report generation for a specific city tag, Col. 37, Line 8- Col. 40, Line 24; and Col. 29,*

*Lines 36-56);* and

Indicating a matching utterance for rendering to a voice browser *(generating an audio*

*announcement, Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11).*

Although Ladd teaches a voice browser system that is capable of generating an audio

prompt based on a voice browser user input and utilizes a prompt mapping configuration, Ladd

does not explicitly teach a prompt mapping configuration having a plurality of occurrences of

specific words in common for different contexts. Uppaluru, however, discloses such a mapping

configuration. Uppaluru discloses that instances of the same numerical text sequence or

character text sequence are mapped to different audio prompts based on a context *(same*

*numerical text spoken differently as money, decimal, date, etc. and same character text spoken*

*differently as a word or spoken sequence of characters, Col. 22, Line 32- Col. 23).*

Ladd and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in

voice-enabled browsers. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Ladd with the further prompt mapping

scheme taught by Uppaluru in order to provide a further means of specifying how audio data

should be presented to a user *(Uppaluru, Col. 8, Lines 11-13).*

6.      **Claim 36** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd et al in

view of Uppaluru and further in view of Saylor et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,501,832).*

With respect to Claim 36, Ladd in view of Uppaluru discloses the method for context-

based audio prompts in a voice browser, as applied to Claim 35. Ladd in view of Uppaluru does

not specifically suggest additionally selecting an audio advertisement to render based on

contextual information, however, Saylor discloses voice advertisement elements indexed to a

particular pertinent voice page context *(Col. 14, Lines 46-62; Col. 18, Lines 46-65; Col. 27,*

*Lines 33-56; Col. 36, Line 48- Col. 37, Line 3; and example of indexed voice ad, Col. 38, Line*

*33- Col. 39, Line 12).*

Ladd, Uppaluru, and Saylor are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in voice page access using voice browsers. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Ladd in

view of Uppaluru with the voice ads taught by Saylor in order to provide a means for revenue

generation for voice page providers *(Saylor, Col. 7, Lines 19-24).*


## *Conclusion*


7.      The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

Osder et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,493,606)-* discloses multiple prompts for different languages

mapped to a single prompt element.

Osder et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,058,166)-* discloses a system for prompt management having

multiple prompts for different languages mapped to a single prompt element.

8.      Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached at  (571) 272-7603.  The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.  Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.  Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only.  For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
8/15/2007